



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/542,723	07/20/2005	Michael Menth	2003P00697WOUS	8414

28524 7590 03/16/2010  
SIEMENS CORPORATION  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT  
170 WOOD AVENUE SOUTH  
ISELIN, NJ 08830

EXAMINER
----------

CHAN, SAI MING

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2462

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

03/16/2010

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/542,723	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MENTH ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> SAI-MING CHAN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2462	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 December 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

**Claims 11-19, 21, 24-30** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Holender et al. (U.S. Patent # 5727051)**.

Consider **claim 11**, Holender et al. clearly show a method for setting limit values of an access control for limiting traffic transmission in a communication network, wherein the communication network comprises a plurality of pairs of marginal nodes between which the transmission occurs (fig. 17, col. 4, lines 41-42), and the limit values of the access control are limit values regarding the pairs (abstract (equalizing blocking probabilities and optimal allocation of resources is determined)), the method comprising the following steps:

setting the limit values such that probabilities for each of the pairs related to not approving the transmission between the marginal nodes of the pair, without explicit path reservation (fig. 17, lines 41-42 (virtual path)), are substantially the same (fig. 9 (904-

908), fig. 12A (1205-1212)), and such that an overload situation in the communication network does not occur (fig. (907));

increasing the limit values to a minimum value at which an overload situation starts to occur (fig. 9 (904-908), fig.12 A&B (1205-1212)), col. 21, lines 9-11), such that the probabilities are substantially the same (fig. 9 (907 - make blocking uniform among the VPs)); and

updating the limit value regarding at least one of the pairs of marginal nodes, between which a transmission occurs causing the overload situation, by setting the limit value to the minimum value (fig. 9 (908-911)).

Consider **claim 26**, it is being rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1, except margin nodes and internal nodes (Holender: fig. 6, col. 8, lines 44-53 (601-605 edge) ((611-614 cross-connects)).

Consider **claim 28**, it is being rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 11 and 26.

Consider **claim 12**, and **as applied to claim 11 above**, Holender et al. clearly disclose the method wherein the probabilities related to not approving the transmission between the marginal nodes of the pairs are blocking probabilities related to blocking the transmission between the marginal nodes of the pairs (fig. 6 (601-605)).

Consider **claim 13**, and **as applied to claim 11 above**, Holender et al. clearly disclose the marginal nodes include nodes of the network representing sources or sinks of traffic of the network (fig. 6 (601-605)).

Consider **claim 14**, and **as applied to claim 11 above**, Holender et al. clearly disclose a method, wherein the marginal nodes are specified by ingress nodes and egress nodes of the network (fig. 6 (601-605)).

Consider **claim 15**, and **as applied to claim 14 above**, Holender et al. clearly disclose a method wherein the plurality of the pairs comprises all pairs of the network consisting of an ingress node and an egress node in each case (fig. 6 (601-605)).

Consider **claim 16**, and **as applied to claim 11 above**, Holender et al. clearly disclose the method wherein the overload situation is produced when in a scenario of high traffic load, in which the limit values for the access controls are still adhered to (fig. 9 (904-908)), a threshold value is exceeded on a link for the traffic transmitted over the link (fig. 12A (1205-1212)).

Consider **claim 17**, and **as applied to claim 16 above**,  
**claim 21**, and **as applied to claim 20 above**,

Hollender et al. clearly disclose a method, wherein the threshold value for the traffic transmitted over the link is assigned to the link such that in case of failure of the link, the traffic allowed within the framework of the access controls does not represent any overload (col. 12, line 65-col. 13, line 3 (critical link))).

Consider **claim 18**, and **as applied to claim 11 above**, it is being rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 11.

Consider **claim 19**, and **as applied to claim 18 above**, Holender et al. clearly disclose the method, comprising repeating the further steps until the limit values for all of the pairs are determined (fig. 9 (904-908)).

Consider **claim 24**, and **as applied to claim 11 above**, Holender et al. clearly disclose and show a network node with means for executing the method (fig. 9 (904-908)).

Consider **claim 25**, and **as applied to claim 24 above**, Holender et al. clearly discloses and shows a network node wherein the network node is a marginal node of the network (fig. 6 (601-605)).

Consider **claim 27**, and **as applied to claim 26 above**, it is being rejected for the same reason as set forth in claims 14 and 15

Consider **claim 29**, and **as applied to claim 28 above**, it is being rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 11.

Consider **claim 30**, and **as applied to claim 29 above**, it is being rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 11.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

**Claims 20, and 22-23** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Holender et al. (U.S. Patent # 5727051)**, in view of **Fodor et al. (U.S. Patent #6788646)**.

Consider **claim 20**, and **as applied to claim 18 above**, Holender et al. clearly disclose and show the method as described.

However, Holender does not specifically disclose the further overload situation is produced when in a further scenario of high traffic load, in which the limit values for the access controls are still adhered to, a further threshold value is exceeded on a further link for the further traffic transmitted over the further link.



In the same field of endeavor, Fodor et al. clearly show the further overload situation is produced when in a further scenario of high traffic load, in which the limit values for the access controls are still adhered to, a further threshold value is exceeded on a further link for the further traffic transmitted over the further link (fig. 2; column 11, lines 19-59 (iterative steps to tune the cut-off parameters to its maximum in order to minimize the blocking probabilities)).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to demonstrate a method for setting limit value, as taught by Holender, and show overload situation is produced when in a further scenario of high traffic load, in which the limit values for the access controls are still adhered to, a further threshold value is exceeded on a further link for the further traffic transmitted over the further link, as taught by Fodor, so that capacity can be optimized.

Consider **claim 22**, and **as applied to claim 11 above**, Holender et al. clearly disclose and show the method as described.

However, Holender does not specifically disclose making access checks for all the traffic of a class of service.

In the same field of endeavor, Fodor et al. clearly show making access checks for all the traffic of a class of service (column 5, lines 27-47 (provide the contracted QoS)).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to demonstrate a method for setting limit value, as taught by Holender, and show making access checks for all the traffic of a class of service, as taught by Fodor, so that capacity can be optimized.

Consider **claim 23**, and **as applied to claim 22 above**, Holender et al. clearly disclose and show the method as described.

However, Holender et al. do not specifically disclose the access checks relate to an approval or rejection of individual flows.

In the same field of endeavor, Fodor et al. clearly show the access checks relate to an approval or rejection of individual flows (column 1, lines 58-65 (reject new calls to protect in-progress calls in order to provide QoS)).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to demonstrate a method for setting limit value, as taught by Holender, and show the access checks relate to an approval or rejection of individual flows, as taught by Fodor, so that capacity can be optimized.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments filed on 12/28/2009, with respect to claims 11 and 18, on pages 2-5 of the remarks, have been carefully considered.

In the present application, Applicants basically argue, that Meempat does not show "without explicit path reservation" and "limit value". The Examiner has introduced a new reference which teaches or suggests "without explicit path reservation" and "limit value". See the above rejections of claims 11 and 18 for the relevant interpretation and citations found in Holender, disclosing the missing limitations.

### ***Conclusion***

Any response to this Office Action should be **faxed to (571) 273-8300 or mailed to:**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**Hand-delivered responses** should be brought to

Customer Service Window  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street

Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Sai-Ming Chan whose telephone number is (571) 270-1769. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Seema Rao can be reached on (571) 272-3174. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 571-272-4100.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

/Sai-Ming Chan/

Examiner, Art Unit 2462

Application/Control Number: 10/542,723  
Art Unit: 2462

Page 12

March 10, 2010  
/Seema S. Rao/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2462